

VZCZCXYZ0015
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHC #0491 3311601
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 271550Z NOV 07
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK IMMEDIATE 0000
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA IMMEDIATE 0000

UNCLAS STATE 160491

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [AORC](#) [UN](#) [UNGA](#) [SOCI](#)
SUBJECT: REVISED INSTRUCTIONS -- WSSD RESOLUTION.

REF: STATE 159204.

¶1. State 159204 was an instruction cable, sent on November 21, on the G-77/China resolution "On the Implementation of the Outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the Twenty-Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly." This cable supplements those instructions.

¶2. Paragraphs of concern.

-- OP 14 and OP 14 bis. Israel could not accept wording in an earlier draft related to the issues of foreign occupation and terrorism, and had declared its intention to call for a vote and vote NO on the entire resolution. In the November 12 version of the resolution, the latest one available, the pertinent paragraphs are OP 14 and OP 14 bis.

As of the evening of November 26, Israel, the chair, and other interested delegations are still in intense discussions to try to arrive at wording which could dissuade Israel from calling for a vote.

-- OP 29. In addition, OP 29 of the resolution "Urges developed countries that have not yet done so in accordance with their commitment, to make concrete efforts towards meeting the targets of 0.7 percent of their GNP for ODA to developing countries and 0.15 to 0.2 percent of their GNP to LDCs, and encourages developing countries to build on the progress achieved in ensuring that ODA is used effectively to help meet development goals and targets."

The U.S. had argued unsuccessfully to remove the word "meeting" from this paragraph because it represents a substantive change in agreed language on ODA.

¶3. Instructions for USUN.

A) If by the time of action Israel's concerns on the resolution are not satisfied and they call for a vote on the entire resolution, USDEL should follow the instructions in State 159204 and vote NO along with Israel. Points for an Explanation of Vote are contained both in that cable and below.

B) Alternatively, if by the time of action compromise wording has been arrived at that Israel can accept and which dissuades them from calling for a vote on the resolution as a whole, Mission is instructed to join consensus on the WSSD resolution with an EOP, drawing from the points below.

BEGIN POINTS for an EOY or EOP.

-- The United States regrets that this resolution on the World Summit for Sustainable Development, which has until now not contained any references to foreign occupation, has become politicized by the inclusion of that term. The term is widely recognized to signify a position on an extremely

controversial issue, one that should not taint Third Committee deliberations.

-- The U.S. also takes issue with the use of committee resolutions such as these to rework and redefine the development language that was so carefully negotiated in Monterrey. Well-meaning sponsors of an expanded vocabulary unwittingly undermine the consensus that allowed donors to commit to increasing their Official Development Assistance (ODA). The addition of the verb "meeting" in OP 29 to describe the 0.7 percent of GNP for ODA as an MDG target is a case in point.

-- While the U.S. has more than doubled its ODA since the Monterrey summit, we believe that a narrow focus on ODA overlooks other vital sources of financing for development. Numerous studies have shown that other international financing sources, such as private investment flows, remittances, and private philanthropy, dwarf ODA. According to recent World Bank statistics, a staggering \$647 billion in private investment capital alone flowed into developing countries in 2006.

-- ODA, when applied strategically and effectively in areas such as governance, health and education, and free-market reform can leverage critical changes that are vital for societies' long-term growth and attract foreign investment. By contrast, an obsession with ODA to the exclusion of these essential financing and policy factors undermines previously agreed international consensus on generating global economic growth and development. Incessant maneuvering and word-smithing around the 0.7 percent target is a case in point. It neither addresses critical governance and effectiveness issues, nor the specific needs of its recipients.

END POINTS.
RICE